DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 193 JC 730 117

AUTHOR Bearden, Margaret R.
TITLE Sex Discrimination in San Diego County Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION National Organization for Women, San Diego, Calif. San Diego Chapter.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; *Sex Discrimination; Statistical Data; *Women Teachers
IDENTIFIERS California; *San Diego County

ABSTRACT

A statistical study of six of the public two-year colleges in San Diego County reveals a significant institutional bias against women instructors. These colleges have a total full-time faculty of 991, of which 264 are women. Four of the colleges have 26% women instructors, one has 24%, and one has 30%. Of the 264 women faculty, 94 teach in the vocational division, notably in the specialities of cosmetology, nursing, and clerical studies, whereas only 133 of the 727 male instructors teach vocational subjects. The breakdown of women instructors in other segments of the faculty is: Physical Education 20, Non-teaching 33, and Arts and Sciences 117. Of the total of 133 persons in the six colleges who are employed in the non-teaching areas, there are only 9 women librarians, 16 women counselors although the student body is 39% female, and 5 women administrators, who are not in key policy-making positions. A qualified pool of women is assumed to exist as approximately 34% of the master's degrees awarded locally were awarded to women. However, it was found that practices used to recruit faculty resulted in discrimination against women. Proper and possible remedies to the problem are provided. It is concluded that the discrimination, once discovered, should be corrected as it jeopardizes the quality of education for women students, equality of employment opportunity for women instructors, and the legal and ethical position of the community colleges. Notes and a copy of a letter sent to the California Fair Employment Practices Commission are provided. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076193

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Margaret R. Bearden

Research by
Dr. Karen Leonard, Ass. Professor, University of California, Irvine
Dr. Patricia Fouquet, University of California, San Diego Extension
Ms. Margaret Bearden, Candidate for Ph.D. in History, University of California, San Diego

Sponsored by National Organization for Women, San Diego Chapter

August, 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 15 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 730 117

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTIES

Recent studies of American college and university faculties have documented a serious pattern of discrimination against women. It seemed, however, that two-year colleges did not share in this de facto discrimination since their faculties with a 40 percent women instructor ratio matched closely the ratio of women to men in the total labor market.[1] Many assumed that highly qualified women, denied full participation in the four-year institutions, were utilitized in the community colleges, where teaching positions are less desirable in terms of lower salaries, heavier teaching loads, and restricted research opportunities. However, a statistical study of a single California area, San Diego County, reveals a significant institutional bias against women instructors in the public two-year colleges. Women instructors constitute less than 27 percent of the total faculties, and they are largely segregated in areas of traditional female employment such as nursing. Men hold 79 percent of the teaching positions in the arts and sciences, the largest single division of the faculty. Either San Diego County is a startling exception to the national pattern or significant new discriminatory practices are now developing side by side with the rapid growth of the community college system.

This problem should be resolved with all possible speed since the anticipated growth of the community colleges will insure a lasting impact on the future faculty composition from current hiring practices.[2] Moreover, without formal affirmative action commitments, the serious job shortage facing teachers at this time may serve to increase the discriminatory patterns since women traditionally have been the last hired-first fired in a tight labor market.[3] The problem must be corrected on the basis of simple justice to a large segment of the tax-paying community. Women should be represented on the community college faculties at least in the same numbers as they appear in the labor market and in the student bodies of these schools.[4]

The seven public two-year colleges in San Diego County have a total full-time faculty of 991 persons. San Diego City College, Mesa College, and

San Diego Evening College are within the San Diego City unified district and have a common personnel system. Grossmont College in the east county, MiraCosta in the far north, Palomar in the north, and Southwestern in the southern part of the county have separate districts, governing boards, and personnel systems. This study was based on the full-time faculty listed in the official 1971-72 catalogs for each college, which excluded San Diego Evening College since its program is basically extended day, employing hourly instructors. The extended day instructors were not included in this study since the statistics are difficult to obtain and not reliable.[5] Striking similarities among the colleges were evident. Four of the six colleges have 26 percent women instructors on the faculty. Palomar College lags with 24 percent, while Mesa College leads with 30 percent women. The statistics appear in Table 1.

TABLE I

COLLEGE	NUMBER OF WOMEN	TOTAL FACULTY	PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN
Mesa College	74	250	30 percent
Southwestern	42	162	26
Grossmont	60	233	26
San Diego City	41	157	26
MiraCosta	15	57	26
Palomar	32	132	24
Totals	264	991	26.6 percent

San Diego County community colleges employ women faculty members in percentages far beneath the national averages for all two-year colleges, far lower than the percentage of women in the local labor force, far lower than the percentage of women students in either the community college or four-year college student bodies, and far lower than the percentages of women receiving degrees locally or nationally.[6] We were unable, in the course of this research, to discover a rational explanation for the institutional patterns of discrimination since qualified women do apply for positions. Neither did we discover much concern over the problem among the administrators or hiring committees contacted. While the college administrators pay homage

to broad principles of fair employment practices, they have failed to develop meaningful affirmative action programs.

After the gross statistics on female faculty were determined, the next question concerned the pattern of placement for the women who are hired. Are the 264 women listed as full-time faculty spread evenly throughout the system or are they found primarily in certain areas? To study this aspect of the problem the faculty was divided into four segments: physical education, recreation, and health; non-teaching faculty such as librarians, counselors, and administrators; vocational instructors, including technical and business subjects; and the arts and sciences faculty responsible for the basic transfer courses that correspond to the lower division subjects of the four-year colleges and universities. This division followed closely the system used by some colleges, while deviating from others. To make useful comparisons, however, it was necessary to establish uniform categories. Table 2 summarizes the sex composition of the various segments of the faculty.

TABLE 2

CATEGORY	WOMEN FACULTY	TOTAL FACULTY	PERCENTAGE WOMEN
Physical education	20	70	29 percent
Non-teaching	33	133	25
Vocational	94	227	41
Arts and sciences	117	559	21

Women are heavily concentrated in the less academic fields, those traditionally associated with "women's careers." Of the 264 women in the San Diego community colleges, 94 or over 35 percent teach in the vocational division, notably in the specialities of cosmetology, nursing, and clerical studies. Of the 727 male instructors, 133 teach vocational subjects. So while we find 35 percent of the women faculty in the less academic areas, less than 19 percent of the men are similarly situated. The difference in position according to sex is impossible to explain except as part of a general discriminatory pattern. The combined colleges offer well over 100 separate occupation-centered programs, but women are represented largely in the following areas: nursing, clerical, cosmetology, medical and dental assisting, child development, and home economics.

It is discouraging to document the stereotyping of sex roles, especially since the girls are training for the lowest paying jobs. The vocational division, which requires far less academic preparation as a general rule, represents the only bright spot for women who aspire to teach in the community colleges.

A serious example of discrimination appears in the non-teaching area. While employing only 133 persons in the six colleges, it contains important positions vital to the educational establishment. Of 21 librarians, only 9 are women, a somewhat lower number than expected in this traditionally female field. (Studies have indicated, however, that as librarian pay and status has increased since the Second World War, the percentages of women has declined.[7]) Of 52 counselors only 16 are women, a lower figure than the 39 percent female student body would seem to warrant. It is in administration, however, that the most serious inbalance is found. Only 5 women are listed as administrators out of 51 persons. None of the 5 women occupy key policy-making positions such as president or dean of instruction. For example, Grossmont College's lone woman administrator is the assistant to the Dean of Activities. The bias against women administrators only worsens at higher levels. The San Diego City community colleges are under a district staff of 24 persons. Of these high level administrators only one, a coordinator of vocational education, is a woman. She shares that particular title and responsibility with six men. While 41 percent of the vocational instructors are women teaching female specialities, women are unable to administer even those areas. Women appear to be excluded from the seats of power, not because of conspiracy, but as a result of unplanned, unrecognized institutional discrimination.

The arts and sciences division with 559 persons listed as faculty is both the largest and the most discriminatory of the divisions. It occupies a very important role since the California master plan for higher education encourages most lower division students to remain in the community colleges. State colleges and universities concentrate on upper division and graduate work. From 66 to 75 percent of all community college students identify themselves as transfer oriented. Of the 559 persons in this division, 117 are women and 432 are men. Women compose less than 21 percent of the arts and sciences faculty. Expressed another way, women would have to hold 105 more positions in order to match the 40 percent

ratio of women in the San Diego labor market. The serious under-representation of women in arts and sciences is difficult to explain except in the shallow rationalizations that surfaced earlier in the civil rights movement. Recent studies indicate that women usually work after receiving advanced degrees. A qualified pool of women may be presumed to exist in the San Diego area, according to a preliminary study of advanced degrees. Approximately 34 percent of the master's degree, the basic community college teaching requirement, are awarded locally to women. Early studies indicate the presence of women employed in jobs that do not utilize their professional training. The simple fact seems to be that competent women have been discouraged by both subtle and open discrimination, rather than sought out by concerned administrators and hiring committees.

To analyze the extent and the precise areas of discrimination within the arts and sciences a further division of faculty was made. Five major categories grouping similar disciplines conformed to the departmental organization of some colleges. Since many persons teach more than one subject, the highly specialized divisions of the four-year schools are less signficant in the community colleges. The arts and sciences division includes the following groupings:

Language and Communication: English, foreign language, speech, theater arts, journalism, oral communication

Behavioral Sciences: anthropology, sociology, psychology

Fine Arts: art, music, photography, graphics

Sciences: mathematics, chemistry, biology, botony, electronics, zoology

Social Sciences: history, political science, economics, geography, black studies, and similar programs

These categories do not necessarily reflect divisions used by an individual college since each groups faculty by a different method. The classification is designed to make comparisons possible among colleges and among the various disciplines. The statistics appear in Table 3. The 11 percent female faculty in mathematics and science, while distressing, was not altogether unexpected. The 8 percent female faculty in social science was a total surprise since the cultural bias against women did not seem strong in those disciplines. No reason for the gross discrimination in social sciences was uncovered in this research.

TABLE 3

CATEGORY - ARTS AND SCIENCES	TOTAL WOMEN	TOTAL FACULTY	PERCENTAGE WOMEN
Language and communication	59	185	31 percent
Behavioral sciences	18	54.5	33
Fine arts	14	59.5	25
Science and math	19	168.5	11
Social sciences	7	91.5	8
Totals	117	559.	21 percent

Table 3 reveals under-representation of women in each category. Some categories--notably science and social science--are shocking areas of discrimination and obviously compensatory hiring should be immediately instituted by any institution following state or federal affirmative action guidelines. The appalling discrimination of some, however, should not overshadow significant problems in categories that seem more balanced in sex composition. Injustice by standards of equity and fairness or illegality by standards of state and federal law do not lose their ugly characters by being less illegal or less inequitable. Wrong is wrong whether many individual women are treated unlawfully or simply one woman denied justice.

To illustrate pockets of discrimination the teaching area of English can be analyzed. In this traditionally female field only 40 women teach out of a total faculty of 119 persons. Women have a 35 percent position which seems a happy contrast to social science with its 8 percent women faculty or even the arts and sciences division with its 21 percent women faculty. But consider the following: San Diego State College from 1967 through 1971 awarded 99 master of art degrees in English--64 of them to women.[8] Yet possessing this basic community college teaching qualification the young woman, twice as likely as her male counterpart to earn the advanced degree, is only one-third as likely to be rewarded with a position on a local community college faculty. Should we wonder at the numbers of women possessing the M.A. in English who become secretaries? And once secretaries they are likely to be viewed as lacking ability and ambition because they accepted work far below their professional qualifications. And some observers even compound the problem by choosing to define the situation as female perversity and a good excuse to deny aid to women graduate students since women "obviously under-utilize their education."

The patterns in the English departments of these community colleges

underscores a point long felt by many well educated women. They are welcome as students, qualifed to receive even advanced degrees, but lack some crucial factor that would identify them as "qualified enough" to be invited to join college faculties in numbers even approaching equity. The definition of "qualified enough" or "best qualified" is a subjective matter in most cases. Few hiring committees use absolute standards of college grade point average, number of publications, or similar criteria. Rather the hiring decision is often governed by subjective attitudes about who will "fit" the department image of itself, who will be a good teacher, who will contribute most to the college in the years ahead. The tendency exists for a group to see those most like its present members as subjectively "best." So a white, male, middle-class hiring committee must make a special effort if it is not to perpetrate past injustices simply because they are now woven into the status quo. Are the stereotypes surrounding intellectual pursuits the real bar to the employment of qualified women?

The statistics indicate that women are grouped in traditional fields and that large parts of the community college system have no women at all. To illustrate this, note that Grossmont College has no women in the following fields: history, biological science, humanities, philosophy, astronomy, physics, and criminology. These all male departments at Grossmont College employ a total of 40 faculty persons. Speech arts, social science, communication arts, chemistry, earth sciences, and music employ an additional 40 persons, with each of these departments having exactly one woman, surely tokenism of the highest degree. Modern languages and nursing employ 24 out of the 60 women on Grossmont College's faculty. And Grossmont is typical--the pattern is repeated over and over. Nearly half of Southwestern College's women faculty are in modern languages and nursing. Twenty-five of the 41 women faculty at San Diego City College are in languages and the traditional female vocational areas. Of the 70 persons in the arts and sciences division of Palomar College, 8 are women, half of whom are in languages. Science, mathematics, behavioral sciences, and fine arts departments at Palomar each employ the single woman. Is she to be the token that conceals the patterns of discrimination?

The point is not to indict each college individually, but rather to illustrate that the discriminatory pattern is institutional. Just as individual injustice or ill will is not the cause, individual good will is not the answer. To correct such a serious bias against women will require institutional affirmative action commitments, in addition to a forceful policy of education and persuasion by college administrators.

With the problem documented, the next issue concerns proper and possible remedies. All agree that the quality of community college education is the most significant consideration, but legitimate differences of priorities do exist. Some persons advocate gradual reform, pointing to stability and useful traditions that may be jeopardized by strong affirmative action programs. Some hiring committees fear that competent women do not exist in sufficient numbers and that concrete goals may mean hiring less qualified persons simply on the basis of sex. Problems do exist. It is the position of this paper, however, that the quality of education will be seriously damaged if perceived injustice is not corrected, if state and federal law is evaded or disobeyed, if the needs of the female half of our socity are disregarded. Quality education is a broad concept and refers to a broad spectum of goals.

Time is an equity consideration since women professionals are now denied jobs, colleges are denied the full participation of talented persons regardless of sex, and young women students are educated in classroons dominated by sex discriminatory policies. Some would argue that colleges will benefit from the contributions that women can bring, although the idea of special feminine talents is admittedly a sexist approach. Colleges will certainly benefit, however, from practicing the democratic theory they preach. They, above all, should earnestly desire to comply with both the spirit and letter of the laws on fair employment practices. Education may well improve as these goals are achieved.

The first approach should be an effort to persuade the responsible authorities that a problem exists, to document the extent of the problem, and to offer public support in the programs necessary for an equitable solution. The San Diego County community colleges have now passed resolutions and directives which take the first step toward solution.[9] Directives and resolutions must be made explicit and translated into administrative efforts producing concrete results. Resistance at the departmental level should be anticipated; guidelines and definite goals should be established to insure compliance. These steps are

not the demands of feminist groups but rather legal requirements under both California and federal law. For community colleges in other states, such steps may be requested in terms of social equity, the laws of the specific state if applicable, or federal law if a college receives over $50,000 in federal money from all programs combined.

According to California law, "The opportunity to seek, obtain and hold employment without discrimination because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or sex is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right."[10] Four individuals in San Diego County filed a request for an investigation with the Fair Employment Practices Commission. The college involved, after consultation with a state representative, has moved toward an affirmative action commitment. In addition, the San Diego chapter of the National Organization for Women has requested a class investigation of the discriminatory patterns and hiring practices of all the San Diego County community colleges. The final result of legal efforts may be a marked improvement over past procedures.

If the discriminatory patterns persist, however, a further legal remedy exists in federal law. Investigation of the budgets of these community colleges revealed a substantial amount of federal aid given in various forms. According to Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375, pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, federal agencies are required, if a complaint is filed, to investigate sex discrimination in any agency receiving federal grants of $50,000. If discrimination is found, it must be corrected or strong and meaningful affirmative action programs instituted or federal funds must be withdrawn. The Department of Labor is charged with enforcement of this law. It has determined that colleges and universities are included within its provisions in their capacity as employers of faculty persons. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been delegated the responsibility for enforcement of this law in educational institutions.[11] Several large colleges and universities have already found substantial amounts of federal money jeopardized by continued patterns of sex discrimination. Many feel that HEW may not be willing to investigate schools holding small grants (those under one million dollars) at this time due to limited staff and heavy workloads. However, the precedents are being established. The probable increased federal funding for community colleges will make the federal law an increasingly potent weapon against discrimination.

Community college officials across the nation should inspect their faculty patterns and hiring practices. Possibly San Diego County is an exception; probably it reflects a general discriminatory situation that has developed without design. Wherever illegal and unjust discrimination is discovered it should be corrected since it jeopardizes the quality of education for women students, equality of employment opportunity for women instructors, and the legal and ethical position of the community colleges.

NOTES

[1]The 40 percent national figure given by Bernice Sandler, Education Specialist, U.S. House of Representatives, Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, in Women's Role in Contemporary Society, E.H. Norton, ed. (New York, 1972), 581. Dr. Sandler compared the 40 percent figure to the 19 percent figure found in four-year colleges. She also noted that in 1870, women were one-third of the faculty in American institutions of higher education, as contrasted to less than 25 percent today. (568) Numerous studies on academic discrimination by organizations such as the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, and the American Political Science Association all document sex discrimination. Special problems exist at the point of entry to the first college teaching job.

[2]Growth projections given in Carnegie Studies on Higher Education. Presidential Adviser, Robert Finch indicated likelihood of increased federal support, as well as citing growth figures. (San Diego Union, June 11, 1972, B.3.) Federal money increases both growth potential and federal fair employment practice influence.

[3]Dorothy Sexton, "The Current Status of Women in the Historical Profession in the Western States," American Historical Association Newsletter (Vol. I, No. 3, May 1972), 11. Dr. Sexton found that the current hiring crisis has reduced female hiring more severely than male hiring.

[4]Approximately 39 percent female student bodies, 40 percent of degrees and certificates to females. Wide, unexplained differences among the six colleges. For example, San Diego City has 28 percent women who receive 40 percent of degrees. Southwestern has 40 percent women who receive only 36 percent of degrees. More study is necessary on problems relating to female failure to fullfill potential. According to Labor Market Analyst for the California Department of Human Resources Development, women compose over 39 percent of the San Diego labor force.

[5]Partial statistics for three colleges indicate majority of hourly paid community college instructors for extended day program is female. Extended day instructors are paid far less, receive no fringe benefits, and have no job security.

[6]The local four-year state college awards 41 percent of its B.A. and B.S. degrees to women, and 34 percent of its graduate degrees to women. Women students nationally as well as locally are discouraged from graduate level by advisers, lack of graduate support, and perceived employment discrimination.

[7]Anita Schilling, librarian, University of California, San Diego, presented research to panel on sex discrimination. September, 1970, American Political Science Convention, Los Angeles, Calif. Women libararians receive substantially less than men when degrees and experience similar. The growth in discrimination in library science may parallel a similar pattern in community college faculties.

[8]Statistics on four-year institutions are not properly a part of this study. However the parallel between discrimination in four-year schools and the discriminatory patterns in the arts and sciences division of the community colleges is striking. The vocational division pattern seems more closely related to job force figures. An illustration of academic discrimination at its worst is the English Department at San Diego State College with 67 persons on its faculty, 13 of whom are women. English M.A.'s in a ratio of 2 to 1 go to women.

[9]"Existing formal commitments to 'affirmative action' are weak and particularly so with respect to women. . . . Note that the Miracosta resolution actually precludes affirmative action; the Mesa and City resolutions are concerned only with ethnic and racial minorities . . . ; the Southwestern resolution calls for ethnic representation proportionate to district population but only for 'improvement' in the ratio of women. Palomar's recently-passed resolution is strong but may be amended . . . ; the Grossmont Board's action . . . is not yet known." Karen Leonard, Chairwoman

Task Force on Academic Discrimination, San Diego National Organization for Women, in letter to Mr. Pier Gherini, California Fair Employment Practice Commission Chairman, in request for formal class investigation. June 8, 1972.

[10]State of California, Fair Employment Practice Act, Chapter 121, Part 4.5, Division 2, Labor Code. College and university faculty have been determined to come under the protection of this Act.

[11]Concerned persons should order the following material which details the federal law. Executive Order 11246; Executive Order 11375; Obligations of Federal Contractors and Subcontractors; Affirmative Action Programs (Order Number 4); and OFCC Sex Discrimination Guidelines. All are available upon request from Office of Federal Contract Compliance, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 20210. The intent of the federal law is plain. Federal funding should not be supporting sex discriminatory patterns and practices.

According to J. Stanley Pottinger, of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the federal government is going to increase its pressure on colleges and universities to eliminate sex discrimination. Money from federal grants and contracts will be held up if new guidelines are not met. (San Diego Evening Tribune, July 26, 1972, A 15.)

SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGES: Sex Composition of Faculties

Appendix A: Statistics for each college, based on 1971-72 catalog, of numbers of women in categories as labeled. Number of women given as first figure. Total number of faculty in that category given in number following slash.

	Palomar	Southwestern	MiraCosta	Mesa	City	Grossmont	Totals
Non-teaching							
Library	3/4	1/1	0/1	2/4	1/4	2/7	9/21
Counseling	2.5/6.5	1/9	1/1.5	3/13	2/6.5	7/16	16.5/52.5
Administration	1/7.5	2/9	0/6	1/7	.5/8.5	1/13	5.5/51
Medical, other	0/1	0/2	0/0	1/5	1/1	0/0	2/9
							33/133.5
Vocational							
Nursing Ed.	7/7	11/11	3/3	6/6	5/5	9/12	41/44
Home Econ.	2/2	1/1	0/0	2/2	6/6	4/7	15/18
Business Ed.	4/9	2/14	3/5	8/18	7.5/16.5	3/14	27.5/76.5
Technical	0/12	0/8	0/2.5	10/25	1/37	0/4	11/88.5
							94.5/227
Physical Ed.	4.5/12.5	2/11	1/5	5/13.5	2/10	6/18	20.5/70
Arts and Sciences							
Languages	4/23	11/31	3/14	16/45.5	8/20.5	17/51	59/185
Behavioral Science	1/5.5	2/7	2/4	5/18.5	4/7.5	4/12	18/54.5
Fine Arts	1/9.5	3/12	1/3	6/16	0/5	3/14	14/59.5
Science, Math	2/25	5/30	1/7.5	6/45.5	2/19.5	3/41	19/168.5
Social Sciences	0/8	1/16	0/4.5	4/28.5	1/9.5	1/25	7/91.5
							117/559

Appendix B: Sex Composition Expressed in Percentages for Each Field : Percent of Department That is Female

Non-teaching	25 percent total
Library	43
Counseling	31
Administr.	10
Other	22
Vocational	41 percent total
Nursing	93
Home Econ.	83
Business	36
Technical	13
Physical Education	29 percent total
Arts and Sciences	21 percent total
Language	31
Behavioral Sci.	33
Fine Arts	25
Science, Math	11
Social Science	8

SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGES: Copy of letter sent to California Fair Employment Practices Commission, June, 1972

Mr. Pier Gherini, Chairman
Fair Employment Practices Commission
State of California
c/O San Diego Office

Dear Mr. Gherini:

San Diego NOW has carried out an investigation of the sex composition of faculties and the faculty hiring practices of the six San Diego County community colleges. Finding that discrimination against women exists in these publicly-supported colleges, we request you to undertake a 1421 investigation of apparent unlawful practices and to seek to eliminate them by conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

We offer the following evidence to support this request.

1. A clear pattern of discrimination against women is documented by the enclosed statistical survey of sex composition of the six colleges. Please refer to the separate summaries for each college, the page summarizing all six colleges, and the page explaining how the survey was carried out.

   The results indicate that women are most seriously underrepresented in the arts and science faculties, particularly the sciences and social sciences, and in the administrations. The partial survey of part-time teachers, indicating a far higher percentage of women in temporary, part-time positions, also evidences discrimination, as we believe a complete survey of part-timers and their qualifications would reveal better academic qualifications than many full-time men.

2. Practices used to recruit faculty result in discrimination against women, as we demonstrate by the enclosed interviews conducted with officials of all six community colleges.

   We found open admission of recruiting practices which discriminate against women. Some of these practices were mechancial failures. First, there is often a failure to publicize positions available. Second, there is inattention to resumes received in the mail, or these resumes are immediately sorted by one or two individuals (an administrator and/or a department chairman) so that individual opinions receive undue weight. Palomar and MiraCosta do not have any kind of Personnel Office, so that such personal screening has been entirely relied upon. Third, often existing applications are not utilized when a position opens (see Grossmont interview). Fourth, often there is not a standard number of applicants considered and interviewed for each position (see Southwestern interview). We enclose a paper by Dr. Bannister, Personnel Director for City and Mesa, which illustrates the major role institutional procedures play in faculty recruitment.

   In addition to the recruiting procedures criticized above, we found two additional factors which operate against the employment of women. First, in almost all cases early faculty was recruited directly from local high school systems, and these men continue to influence hiring through personal connections and perferences. Second, and in line with preferences of former high school teachers, we found a consistent bias against applicants with Ph.D.'s, on the grounds that such higher academic credientials meant an interest in research and publication rather than teaching. The interest in good teaching is legitimate, but the unthinking extension of this to a negative view of credentials above the MA we believe works against women. We know of many women with higher degrees relegated to part-time jobs or unable to get jobs within the community college system, despite good teaching experience or potential

Copy

SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGES: Copy of letter sent to California F.E.P.C.
second page

3. Existing formal committments to "affirmative action" are weak and particularly so with respect to women. We enclose copies of resolutions passed by faculty Senates or Governing Boards of the six colleges. Note that the MiraCosta resolution actually precludes affirmative action; the Mesa and City resolutions are concerned only with ethnic and racial minorities and are faculty, not Board, policies; the Southwestern resolution calls for ethnic representation proportionate to district population but only for "improvement" in the ratio of women. Palomar's recently passed resolution is strong but may be amended (see interview), and the Grossmont Board's action on the tentative resolution included here is not yet known.

We would like to point out here that the interviews show resistance to placing women in the same category as blacks and Chicano's with respect to special recruiting efforts. None of the colleges which send out notices about positions send them to women's organizations at present, though several send them to black and Chicano organizations.

Futhermore, the six San Diego County community colleges have not complied with resolutions passed by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors in April 1971, calling for development of Affirmative Action programs. (These, again, concerned ethnic and racial minorities.)

We charge discrimination against women in all of these weak existing resolutions and in the total lack of affirmative action programs which would include active recruitment of women.

We would like to qualify the above indictment of hiring practices in two ways. Palomar, as a result of FEPC investigation of four individual complaints, appears to be changing its personnel procedures and attempting to redress its discriminatory pattern (in several respects the worst of the six). And City and Mesa benefit from the good intentions and efficient management of Dr. Bannister but are as much in need of a formal committment to goals and timetables as the others.

For the reasons above--a clear pattern of discrimination, discriminatory hiring practices, and lack of formal policies or programs to redress past discrimination--San Diego County National Organization for Women requests a 1421 investigation of the San Diego County community colleges.

Sincerely,

Dr. Karen Leonard
Chairwoman
Task Force on Academic Discrimination

Copy